

S 3324

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

March 11, 1976

and the eventual loss of their own city's identity.

The question is not whether economies should be made, but how they are to be achieved.

A suburb of Fort Worth, Tex., provides an excellent example. There, a proposed consolidation would achieve an annual \$33,000 saving. However, this economy is apparently to be accomplished by eliminating two positions in that suburban office. Ironically, these positions have been vacant for some time. Thus, the savings could conceivably be realized simply by instructing the postmaster to leave them vacant since the post office was managing quite nicely without them.

I am deeply concerned, too, by the Postal Service's action during the past year to revoke the second-class mailing privileges of scores of colleges and universities throughout this country. These institutions have mailed their catalogs and other course listings at second-class rates since 1907. Legislative language written in 1912 granted that "all periodical publications of * * * a regularly incorporated institution of learning, or * * * a regularly established State institution of learning supported in whole or in part by public taxation * * * shall be admitted to the mails as second-class matter." In 1970, of course, the Congress legislated a sweeping reform of the postal system, and the Postal Service should today note that it chose not to change or withdraw this second-class privilege.

The Postal Service has, however, unilaterally decided to abrogate statutory language and congressional intent. Again, far too little thought has been given to those who will be most affected by its decision.

As of last autumn, the Postal Service has revoked the second-class privileges of more than 200 schools. The financial impact of those actions has been extreme, as examples from my home State suggest.

The Governor of Texas, the Honorable Dolph Briscoe, has estimated that if all of the State's public institutions of higher learning were to lose their second-class privilege, the increase in annual mailing costs would amount to \$7 million. If the schools were to switch to much slower third- or fourth-class service, mailing costs would still be increased by \$2 million.

For the University of Texas at Austin, computing the higher costs is no longer idle speculation. It already has had its second-class privilege revoked, and it now expects to spend \$53,000 a year in additional mailing expenses if it is to maintain present delivery schedules.

That cost will, no doubt, be passed on to both the taxpayers and the students enrolled at Austin. I believe this experience—and scores of others in States across this land—only exemplifies the costs which the Postal Service is imposing on higher education, precisely at a time when other educational expenses are soaring.

Last summer, I was pleased to cosponsor Senator EAGLETON's S. 2015, legislation which would stop the Postal Service from revoking this second-class privilege.

More than half of our colleagues have joined in cosponsoring that legislation. Since then, the House has passed its amendments to the Postal Reorganization Act and included a provision to restore and protect the second-class privilege for colleges and universities.

The Senate Post Office Committee is currently preparing its own amendments to the act. I would hope that it would include this provision on second-class rates in its legislation. It is a matter of vital importance to higher education in this country, and I am confident the Congress fully intends to have this privilege restored.

MANSFIELD'S SENATE

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times citing the outstanding accomplishments of the Senator from Montana during his tenure as majority leader be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1976]

MANSFIELD'S SENATE

It is too early to bid farewell to Mike Mansfield who is retiring next January as Montana's senior Senator and as Senate majority leader. Spare, vigorous, alert, he could well serve the Republic as wise counselor and special envoy in various public and private capacities for many years to come.

But it is timely to take note of the way Mr. Mansfield helped to change the Senate during his record-making sixteen-year tenure as majority leader. The Senate would have changed in any event because the greatly enlarged Democratic majority produced by the "class of '58" was too big, too liberal, too venturesome to be controlled by the close-to-the-vest operations of his renowned predecessor, Lyndon B. Johnson. Moreover, the civil rights revolution that Johnson himself initiated as Senate leader caused a steady erosion of the once-dominant conservative Southern Democratic bloc.

Senator Mansfield's contribution was to welcome change and gently hurry it along. By treating every member as his equal, by appealing to the better rather than the worse side of each man's nature, and by keeping everyone informed rather than ignorant of the leadership's goals and tactics, he made the Senate a much more open and more democratic institution. He made consensus a reality rather than a slogan.

If by this civilized style of leadership, Mr. Mansfield contributed to making the Senate somewhat less productive in terms of bills passed and partisan power exercised, the result was fairly close to what the authors of the Constitution had in mind when they conceived of the Senate. They saw it as a place for the sober second thought and for the full articulation of minority as well as majority views. Mr. Mansfield passes to his successor in the leadership post a worthy legacy of institutional self-confidence and mutual trust.

PLASTIC SURGERY FOR S. 1?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, yesterday's editorial page of the Washington Post carried an especially perceptive article by Congressman MIKVA of the recent attempts to produce a "compromise" version of S. 1. Because I think this article

merits further attention, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLASTIC SURGERY FOR S. 1?

(By ABNER J. MIKVA)

After months of intense national debate about the merits of S. 1, the bill to reform the federal criminal laws, it appears a pivotal point is near as the Senate Judiciary Committee approaches a final decision.

Thanks to a variety of critics, some of the worst atrocities of S. 1 have been exposed. But even so, efforts to defang the S. 1 monster should not obscure the fact that a monster without some of its fangs is still a monster. Unfortunately, there is an apparently new and growing campaign to gloss over the inherent and pervasive defects in S. 1 and to speed the bill to final Senate approval.

Most recently, the Washington Post announced its support for S. 1—minus a number of its "worst" provisions. This followed by several weeks a similar endorsement of S. 1 by the former chairman of the National Commission for Reform of the Federal Criminal Laws, former California Gov. Edmund G. Brown. Gov. Brown now maintains that S. 1 incorporates a "very substantial portion" of the national commission's recommendations and that the "few" repressive sections of S. 1 will no doubt be amended in committee or on the Senate floor.

As a former member of the "Brown Commission" (as the National Commission is frequently called), I have admiration and respect for Pat Brown's leadership on criminal law reform. Unfortunately, I cannot share Gov. Brown's current view (which is held by others, too) that S. 1 warrants passage because it includes a major portion of the Brown Commission's recommendations. Nor are there grounds for the optimism that the blatantly repressive sections of S. 1 will be adequately sanitized by amendments in committee or on the Senate floor.

Back in 1971, after four years of study, the Brown Commission produced a thoughtful compromise, reflecting a variety of views. The real strength of the final product was that it struck an overall balance that tended to outweigh the deficiencies of any particular provision. It was a compromise that produced a product greater than the sum of its parts.

But the fact that the Brown Commission's findings were a compromise, that they did not at all add up to an ideal civil libertarian document, cannot be overlooked. Therefore, S. 1, at best, represents nothing more than a bad compromise of an earlier compromise. From a civil libertarian point of view, if Brown was somewhere near the 50 yard line, S. 1 is now in the end zone—and the wrong end zone, to be sure.

So even if S. 1 includes major portions of the Brown Commission recommendations, it means that S. 1 would only be approaching the original compromise of five years ago. But what about the admittedly repressive features of S. 1 not in the Brown Commission compromise? Is it realistic to expect that all, or even most, of these features would be deleted by amendments? In all probability, the answer is no.

S. 1 is a 753-page bill replete with both well-known and not-so-well-known evils—evils that in the heat of debate, will be overlooked or compromised. Such provisions as the official secrets act, the abolition of the insanity defense and the numerous infringements of free speech in the name of national security are well known and likely to receive the Judiciary Committee's attention.

But there are scores of lesser known provisions in S. 1 that are just as damaging to personal liberty and that may well escape close scrutiny. S. 1, for example, greatly ex-

March 11, 1976

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 3323

resuspension of plutonium by wind and movement. Now, a three-inch boulder containing some radium is not very likely to become airborne. If it does, inhalation of the boulder just would be a bit difficult. So much for the ridiculous assertions about that top foot of the earth and its radium content.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

I won't bore you with this very long time that radioactive waste must be isolated from people. Everyone by now knows all about that. Instead I prefer to regale you with some of the marvelous proposals of the nuclear energy advocates for dealing with this problem.

Since this stuff is dangerous enough to wipe out every man, woman, and child on earth many times over if it gets around, many have proposed careful burial of the waste. "But," say some of the nuclear advocates, "why bury it and guard it? This material is too valuable to bury. Instead will use it in many, many ways in our economy, in our industries, and even in our homes." One early suggestion was to make plutonium-powered coffee pots. (Look, mom, no electric cord for the percolator.)

There is certainly one marvelous solution for solving the radioactive waste problem—just use it everywhere in the USA. I shall leave to you to calculate the expectancy that 1% won't get out with this superbly brilliant scheme.

WHY ARE NUCLEAR PROPONENTS SO AT EASE ABOUT RADIATION?

In closing, let me examine why the nuclear proponents are so relaxed about the health hazards of radiation. Dr. E. F. Schumacher the brilliant economist-philosopher, has said it isn't science and technology that any thinking person should oppose. Science and technology can indeed do marvelous things for us. But Dr. Schumacher has suggested he'd like to see "Science and technology with a human face."

A million cancer deaths is, after all, just a number. Scientists deal with numbers all the time, so 1,000,000 isn't a disturbing number per se. In my earlier medical career, I used to work with cancer and leukemia patients extensively. I served as personal physician to some 30 or 40 of them in the last one to six months of their lives. It might help if every scientist and engineer had that opportunity as part of his (her) education. It is good to know what lives, and breathes, and dies behind a statistic.

Later, I spent two years doing studies on trace elements in a variety of mentally retarded children at Sonoma State Hospital. I had a couple of days a week in the wards, seeing the human results of genetic damage. These children didn't look at all like statistics.

In 1969, after my colleague, Dr. Tamplin, and I had said that 32000 extra cancer deaths per year in this country would be caused if people received the allowable dose of radiation from nuclear energy, we recommended that the radiation standards should be made much tighter. Dr. Michael May, then Director of the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory where I worked, visited me in my office. Clearly he had experienced intense pressure from the AEC. In all my experiences with Dr. May, I had found him to be a fine person and a first-class scientist.

"Jack," he said, "I defend absolutely your right, in fact your duty, to calculate that a certain amount of radiation will cause 32000 extra deaths per year from cancer."

But to my disappointment, he then asked: what makes you think that 32000 would be too many? I must presume he was thinking in terms of the hoped-for benefits of nuclear power . . . technology without a human face.

"Mike," I said, "the reason is very sim-

ple. If I find myself thinking that 32000 cancer deaths per year is not too many, I'll dust off my medical diploma, take it back to the Dean of the Medical School where I graduated, hand the diploma to the Dean and say, 'I don't deserve this diploma.'"

AMENDMENTS TO OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, since enactment of the Occupational Safety and Health Act in 1970, pressures being exerted by the Federal Government on business, especially small business, have increased sharply. In some cases, businesses have been forced to close because they could not cope with the economic consequences of complying with OSHA regulations. Not only have many areas lost valuable employment, but they have also lost the economic support of these small businesses.

Small businesses are the Nation's No. 1 source of jobs, generating millions of dollars in revenue each year which is fed back into the economy through wages, costs of operation and purchasing power. Small businesses constitute 47 percent of all nongovernmental, nonfarm jobs, and more than one-half of all Americans depend directly on small businesses for their livelihood. I have been a critic of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration since its inception because of the strain by overregulation it has placed on small business. It is for this reason that I am especially pleased that my colleague from Nevada is introducing this bill which would give small businesses some breathing room under the OSHA red tape and voluminous regulations.

This bill, for which I strongly urge support by other Senators, would provide that for firms employing 25 persons or less, OSHA personnel could make visits on request to point out problems and make suggestions. This would be done without fear on the part of the small businessman of being cited and would not constitute an inspection. In the measure, small businesses would also be eligible for financial assistance under the 1970 act without having been cited for violations of the rules. When citations were issued, OSHA personnel will have to give the small businessman notice of the financial assistance that is available to him under the act.

Both areas included in the bill are needed, and both would alleviate the burden on the small businessman and also to a degree on the OSHA inspectors themselves. By visiting a firm on a consultative basis, both the businessman and OSHA could be saved the headaches which often accompany citations which are issued and the ensuing bitterness between the Federal agency and the public. It seems to me the change would better serve the public, which should be the intent of all governmental functions. Providing financial assistance to small businesses after violations were pointed out would allow firms to make changes and come in line with the OSHA regulations without having to be further penalized with fines. This could save the Govern-

ment money, since the assistance given the firms would go for changes totally, and not partly to pay the fine.

The major contribution that small businesses make to this country should be cause for concern that the Government not jeopardize their existence. Yet, the massive bureaucracy is tragically suffocating small businesses through regulations, restrictions, and requirements which precede endless amounts of paperwork and red tape.

I urge passage of this bill not for the benefit of special interest groups, but for the small merchants in this country who need relief from Government overregulation, a situation in many cases which they cannot cope with and which is threatening their very existence.

SECOND-CLASS MAILING PRIVILEGES FOR OUR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, during the past several weeks, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has been holding hearings on the Postal Reorganization Act Amendments of 1976. The Postal Service has taken a number of highly controversial actions during the past half-decade, and I am pleased that the Congress is taking this opportunity to review and address them.

All of us have become quite familiar with the problems of the Postal Service since its reorganization. Many of our constituents firmly believe that they are now getting far less service for far greater expense. While I fully understand that the Postal Service has not been immune from the inflation our economy has experienced during the past several years, I believe our citizens are asking legitimate questions about the Service's management practices and decisions.

During the past several months, thousands of rural communities have uneasily awaited word for their fate. Though the Congress in 1970 explicitly stated its intent that service not be diminished and no office be closed because of its unprofitability, the Postal Service seems totally oblivious and determined to close a number of small offices across the Nation. While a resolve to reduce the Postal Service's operating deficits must be supported, I cannot accept the seeming insensitivity of the Service as it orders the closings of these offices.

For that reason, I was pleased to join in cosponsoring the distinguished Minority Leader's bill, S. 2962, which will require the Postal Service to consider a number of factors before it makes a decision on the fate of the offices in our smaller communities. I was pleased, too, with the district court's ruling last week requiring the Service to observe procedures it has published which should insure that some of these factors are considered.

In addition, numerous suburban communities are being told that their post offices are being considered for possible consolidation with the central city's facility, a move they fear will only be the first step toward a reduction in service

pands federal authority to order involuntary confinement of mentally ill persons who have been acquitted of all federal charges or have completed their prison terms. S. 1 grants appellate judges the power to increase sentences imposed by the trial judge. And S. 1 so stretches the conspiracy laws that mere thought becomes a crime in certain situations.

Last November, Reps. Robert Kastenmeier, Don Edwards and I introduced a civil libertarian alternative to S. 1. One of the reasons for introducing a new bill at this late date was to point out the difficulty, if not impossibility, of purging S. 1 of all its pernicious provisions. This new bill, which exceeds 700 pages in length, makes over 1,000 changes in S. 1. And even with all these changes, several remnants of what might be called the Nixon administration-John Mitchell philosophy of criminal law reform escaped attention and remained in a "thoroughly" revised bill.

There is an urgent need for criminal law reform in this country. There was such a need in 1967, too, when the Brown Commission began its work, and in 1971 when the commission reported its recommendations. But a new urgency is to dispel notions that decent reforms can emerge from "a better S. 1." S. 1 started as a monster and no amount of plastic surgery is going to change its character.

GOVERNMENT OVERREGULATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, much emphasis has been placed during the past few months on overdomination by the massive Federal bureaucracy on business and the public. Free enterprise is almost to the point of becoming an endangered species in this country because of the mountains of redtape consisting of restrictions, regulations, and rules under which citizens are required to live and operate their businesses.

I have joined a group of Senators in conducting a series of colloquies during the past 2 months on the subject of regulatory reform, which is desperately needed to halt overregulation by the Federal Government. During those colloquies, numerous examples have been presented which illustrate the near strangulation, in some cases, of free enterprise.

A story in Wednesday's editions of the Washington Star reports another example of overregulation. The advertising industry is regulated to a great degree by the Federal Trade Commission and new rules are being proposed, according to the article, which will further hamper the general industry. Mr. Howard H. Bell of the American Advertising Federation objects to the heavy hand with which the Government is regulating the industry, a characteristic which holds true in other areas as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Star article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMAN OBJECTS TO HEAVY HAND OF GOVERNMENT

The big problem with the advertising business, says Howard H. Bell, of the American Advertising Federation, is that most Americans do not understand its importance.

Granted, Bell admits, ads have become all-pervasive. And he says it's only natural for people to raise objections to something that often invades their lives when they don't

want to see it, tells them things they don't want to hear, and tries to sell them things they don't want to buy.

But without advertising, the economy would crumble, Bell claims.

"The economy of this country is built upon the companies being able to market services. Everybody would lose if advertising did not remain a free and viable force in this country," he said.

And so, as trade association for some 300 advertising agencies and their clients, one of AAF's chief duties is "to apprise the public of the value of advertising and its importance to our economic system."

This function is tied closely to the federation's government lobbying efforts "to ward off legislation which threatens to limit or cripple the responsible advertising of goods and services."

In recent years, Bell says, the \$30 billion-a-year advertising trade has been saddled with unreasonable restrictions, which he attributes directly to an increase in complaints from uninformed consumers.

He points to the Federal Trade Commission as the most ardent enemy, charging it has overstepped its role as watchdog for truth, fairness and accuracy in the business.

The latest example of the government's "misuse of regulatory powers," Bell said, is an FTC proposal that would require the major ingredients of some products to be spelled out in ads.

Such a rule would force advertisers to pay for more time and space in order to deliver their message, he said. "If you have to add a lot of technical information, most of which the public will not understand, it will defeat the purpose of advertising without really helping the consumer."

The industry is also concerned about talk of banning certain types of ads from the electronic media. Proposals by consumer groups to do away with all advertising on children's programs and to ban TV ads for liquor and over-the-counter drugs, are "unnecessary, unproductive and not beneficial to the consumer," Bell said.

He said recent history has proved ad restrictions ineffective in changing national trends. Cigarette smoking, for example, has not decreased, despite the 5-year-old ban on radio and TV cigarette ads, Bell noted.

The relationship between the ad industry and government is not entirely antagonistic. The AAF supports several government regulatory programs, including one that routinely requires businesses to back up their advertising claims.

Much of the advertising controversy today focuses on television, where the ads seem to elicit the strongest reactions from consumers, although they take only 28 percent advertising dollars spent.

The criticism of TV ads focuses on what "clutter," too many commercial interruptions. Many alternatives have been tried (such as grouping commercials at the beginning and end of shows, and funding programs with federal subsidies), Bell said. But the industry has been unable to find an acceptable alternative.

Despite the tremendous expense—commercials during the Superbowl cost \$200,000 a minute—advertisers have found TV relatively cheap because it can get their message across to tens of thousands at one time, usually bringing the cost to about \$2 or \$3 for each potential customer.

Since the federation was formed in 1905, the ad industry has gone a long way in regulating itself, Bell claims. The wild claims of medicine doctors and of miracle drugs found in many turn-of-the-century advertisements have all but disappeared, he said.

The National Advertising Review Board was created four years ago to hear charges of false advertising and to put pressure on advertisers to comply with standards.

Bell admits there are still gray areas—What are good advertising techniques? When is a product over-glamorized? How much sex appeal can be displayed before an ad becomes offensive?

But those are matters of taste, Bell contends. "Certainly the government can't legislate taste, it's far too personal. . . ."

FUTURE OF AMERICA'S SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, it has long been my contention that continuing cutbacks in appropriations for the Nation's space program are pennywise but pound foolish. It has been my contention that the United States, having once gained an overwhelming leadership over the Russians in space technology, could maintain that leadership even with reduced spending if it is on a constant level.

It has been my privilege to watch the great space advances take place at Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala., where the Nation's space programs were shaped. It has also been my privilege as a member of the Alabama State Legislature and as Lieutenant Governor of Alabama to help develop legislation to permit the State to build and maintain a research institute at the University of Alabama in Huntsville where many space-related research programs were carried out for NASA and its Centers.

Our space program is most frequently related with adventure and experience of moon and interplanetary exploration, but the fact of the matter is that the benefits which we have enjoyed in our daily lives as a result of space-related inventions and technology have more than repaid the United States for the cost of the space programs. And the harvest has only just begun. The investments which we have already made, and the programs which are envisioned for the future should go far to help ease the worsening energy crisis. They will bring vast rewards in better methods of farming, in discovery of new mineral deposits, and in new methods of industrial techniques. Every American will enjoy in his daily life ever-increasing benefits from a continuing viable space program.

But I am alarmed at efforts to downgrade space to the point that NASA can no longer conduct the type of experimentation which has brought so many earthly benefits from space-bound projects. Many Members of Congress who have helped lead our Nation into the space age have this same concern. No one is more knowledgeable than our colleague, the senior Senator from Utah who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. Senator Moss has addressed himself many times to the dangers we face through neglect of our investment of space technology. The March 1976 issue of Government Executive, contains an article by its editor, John F. Judge, based on an interview with Senator Moss. The article, "Is the U.S. Losing Its Investment?" gets to the heart of this matter, and I commend its reading to all Members of this body.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE UNITED STATES LOSING ITS INVESTMENT?

(By John F. Judge)

In less than two decades, the U.S. has become totally dependent on space. Almost unnoticed by the public, satellites have gradually become indispensable in communications, weather forecasting, navigation and a large assortment of land uses including agriculture.

Moved to the back burner since the space race days of the early 1960's, the whole realm of space research, technology and operations has lost its front page command—and with this, lost the attention of most elected officials.

In a very real sense, most of the Federal government are creatures of the Congress. When that body ignores an element, that entity often drifts off into a world of its own, feeding on itself at taxpayer expense and usually far from its original reason for existence.

The end result is almost the same as when the Congress, in the name of some greater good visible more during election years than at any other time, sweeps in and out and leaves an agency's budget in shambles.

Both are extremes and both occur.

And there are the in-betweens.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is a case in point. Once the glamour agency and a reaper of headlines, it is now a fairly well disciplined, cost conscious and effective organization. It has settled into the pragmatics of space and is doing so with a high degree of success.

So quietly has it happened that most of the U.S. citizenry takes for granted many of the direct and indirect economic, technical and social benefits derived from space and the work of the space agency.

FUTURE SHOCK

And once again, an agency is being hobbled by the budget process basically because its spending in one given year is directed to reaping rewards in future years. The harvest, in most cases, is not really that far away—it is just down the line enough to be past several elections.

Senator Frank E. Moss (D-Utah) as Chairman of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee has been keeping an eye on space, among other things. "Over the past several years the Congress, the Executive Branch, liberals and conservatives alike have come to agree that NASA, being a research and development agency, operates most efficiently on a relatively constant budget from year to year.

"Roller coaster fluctuations in research programs result in waste—whether the changes are budgetary increases or decreases.

"Yet this year, having slashed the Space Shuttle (See Box) and scuttled the Large Space Telescope, the Administration has apparently discarded altogether the constant-level approach to NASA's budget," says Moss in recent remarks at the National American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics Annual Meeting.

Since real spending power has been relatively constant, the NASA program planners have a realistic view of what they can and cannot expect for the coming fiscal year.

"Furthermore," says Moss, "this constant level budget approach has created within NASA a very sober attitude toward new program proposals. When you must rob existing programs to fund new ones, new ideas receive a very careful scrutiny.

EFFICIENT AGENCY

Moss claims that other federal agencies could benefit from the NASA approach to

spending. Yet the rationale for curbing the space agency's real spending power is the need to trim federal spending.

But Moss claims that NASA has been biting the budgetary bullet for several years. "The agency's real spending power is down to about a third of what it was in 1968. NASA knows what fiscal stewardship is all about. If other agencies have been excessive in their spending in the past, let them follow the path that NASA has already taken.

"Meanwhile, I say let's not take NASA to task for the excesses of other agencies."

Moss is convinced that the past NASA programs, as expensive as they were, have long since returned more than what was invested in real growth to the economy—in jobs, in technology, and in too many other areas to count.

"Certainly we need to trim the fat out of the federal budget, but we also have to be sure we do not shortchange the nation's future in the process. We must realize that some federal activities are income-producing in the long run—and NASA is one of these.

"In a way NASA's budget is part of our nation's portfolio of blue chip investments. We have to invest now to prosper in the future," says Moss.

CUTTING ESSENTIALS

The Senator's position is this. In his view, NASA serves two primary functions with respect to space. One is to develop benefits from space and the other is to obtain fundamental knowledge from space.

The two cuts are in major projects aimed carefully at achieving those two functions. One, the Space Shuttle, offers revolutionary advances in the practical benefits from space. The other, the Large Space Telescope, offers equally revolutionary opportunities to expand our knowledge of the universe.

"Consider the Large Space Telescope. It is probably the single most important basic science project that the scientific community asked the Administration to fund this year.

"This one instrument would allow astronomers and scientists to see many times farther out into space than man has ever seen before.

"Not many civilizations have had the opportunity to purchase and witness such a genuine quantum leap in a basic science."

Moss notes that a medical experiment aboard Apollo-Soyuz proved very successful. Human kidney cells that produce enzymes that dissolve blood clots in veins and arteries were separated from nonproducing cells in space. The separation method only works in a weightless environment.

Says Moss, "This may eventually lead to effective treatment of people having blood clot conditions such as phlebitis. NASA scientists also tell me that unique research on the aging process of the human body will be feasible in the spacelab and such medical benefits alone may make the Space Shuttle well worth the nation's money." Yet funding for the shuttle has been slashed in the current budget requests.

BUDGET STRUCTURE

Moss, himself the third ranking Democrat on the Senate Budget Committee is a fervent booster of the new budget process now being implemented on Capitol Hill.

He calls it Congress' "success story for 1975."

"Congress has begun to make the hard decisions on competing priorities . . . Funding for programs must now be based on both the basic need and on the relative availability of funds to meet that need compared to other national priorities."

Obviously Moss believes that the space programs coming out of NASA fit national priorities now and have not lost the priorities they once possessed.

The Senator from Utah also strongly supports the moves to reorganize the Senate's Committee system. So much so that he is

one of the Members urging that the Senate complete the initial steps before the next election so that "the new Congress can get on with the needed changes." Right now, three separate committees are involved in space and technology matters . . . and energy legislation is another major area where the Senate committee structure has acted as a roadblock to needed legislation."

It happens in space too. NASA has one program moving along—called *Seasat*—which is basically a partnership among several federal agencies, research institutions and the private sector.

The program will be the subject of an upcoming article in *Government Executive* but basically, the program is a real, working partnership among the participants. It is being designed to the needs of the users—in the case NASA has no intention of sending up a satellite that merely sends back data that is warehoused.

In effect, if successful, and there is no reason why it should not completely succeed, there are immediate and direct benefits to the economy of the U.S. and most of the world.

But because each of the participating agencies must turn to Congress to obtain funds, each from its own series of Senate and House committees and subcommittees, a single negative reaction from even a subcommittee involved with one of the partners can endanger the whole program.

Moss says that the Congressional budget system now being developed, and the Senate committee reorganization would solve such problems. And that they need solving is well recognized. *Seasat* has global implications some of which impact directly on the problems of moving vast quantities of crude oil on the surface of the world's oceans.

Moss is not unaware of many domestic problems. He is involved in the current Senate hearings into Medicare and other federal medical program abuses. To the point of actively proposing that Health, Education & Welfare establish a sort of Inspector-General function to penalize states and local jurisdictions which do not work to correct the abuses now coming to light.

His involvement in medical and health care stems from his membership on the Special Committee On Aging. The Senator is also on the Senate Commerce and Post Office & Civil Service Committees.

Moss is not alone in his concern that the U.S. may be losing its potential for the full exploitation of space on this side of the Atlantic. The signs from overseas are that other nations fully recognize what can be drawn from this area in the future.

Charles C. Hewitt, Executive Director of the National Space Institute claims that "recent figures are exceedingly alarming in that the U.S.S.R. seems to be developing a sharper awareness (than the U.S.) of the potential benefits in space for both civilian and military purposes.

"Also, European countries are now allocating ever larger percentages of their national budgets for space research. They understand how technical development maintains economic balance and growth . . . The U.S. may be lagging behind philosophically and strategically."

Data developed by Dr. Charles S. Sheldon II, Chief of the Science Policy Research Division and Senior Specialist in Space and Transportation Technology for the Library of Congress indicates that the Soviet Union, with a gross national product half that of the U.S. maintains a space program at least as large as that of the U.S. at its 1966 peak.

One possible result is that the U.S., in the near future, may move into a more competitive stance with respect to space and embark in another "race", although this would be in a modified form.

But Senator Moss in his insistence on a balanced and consistent space effort—predicated on a sensible budget—says that the